



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/803,779	03/12/2001	Yumi Wakita	MTS-3236US	8894

7590 08/14/2003

Allan Ratner
Ratner & Prestia
One Westlakes Berwyn, Suite 301
P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980

EXAMINER

SMITS, TALIVALDIS IVARS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2655

DATE MAILED: 08/14/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Supplemental
Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/803,779

Applicant(s)
Yumi Wakita et al.

Examiner
Talivaldis Ivars Smits

Art Unit
2655



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 27, 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on Mar 12, 2001 is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

DETAILED ACTION

Restart of Response Period

1. The response time period to the previous Office Action, mailed June 27, 2003, has been restarted, and the Action has been amended, below, because it was incomplete. Due to a clerical error the (Supplemental) Preliminary Amendment (Amendment B) of April 27, 2001, adding claims 14 and 15, was not matched with the case and entered. Applicant's representative Allan Ratner informed the examiner of this omission on July 10, 2003 and FAXed another copy of said Preliminary Amendment, along with the receipt postcard, stamped April 30, 2001 at the OIPE. Thus, Amendment B was entered, and the substitute Office Action, below, now also includes claims 14 and 15.

Specification

2. The Title of the invention is not sufficiently descriptive. A new title is required that is more clearly indicative of the novelty in the invention to which the claims are directed.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The term "voice recognition" is misused (*e.g.* on pages 6, 7, 12) for what nowadays is called --**speech recognition**-- in the speech signal processing art. While "voice recognition" and "speech recognition" were both once used interchangeably to refer to spoken word recognition, nowadays the terms are distinguished. The term "**voice** recognition" now denotes identification

of *who* is doing the speaking (class 704/246), while “**speech** recognition” (or “**word** recognition”) denotes identification of *what* is being said (class 704/251)

Claim numbers, which may change during the examination process, are used in the specification (pages 7-14) rather than being referred to as alternative embodiments.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

4. The drawings of Figures 1, 4, 6, 8, and 9 are objected to.

Figures 1, 4, 6, and 8 are objected to because they refer to “voice” rather than **--speech--** recognition.

Figure 6 is also objected to because its element 21 label should be amended to indicate its difference from Figure 1, by adding to its verbal label a phrase like **--with word error detection--**, since otherwise it is identical to Figure 1 except that the correspondingly-labeled element there has number 7.

Figure 8 is also objected to because it lacks a **--Prior Art--** label.

Figures 9-1(a) through 9-2(e) are objected to because they fail to indicated that **--Prior Art--** is being illustrated. Also, why are these Figure numbers thus designated rather than being labeled Figures 9 (a) through 9 (e)?

5. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in

abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-4, 6-8, and 10-15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Frederick Warwick Michael Stentiford *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,384,701, issued January 24, 1995).

As per claims 1-4, 6-8, and 10-13, Stentiford *et al.* teach:

- selecting co-occurring combinations key words from sentences in a corpus, and identifying each key word combination with an expression (phrase, col. 2, lines 35-37 and 40-43 with col. 4, lines 3-6);
- key words and combinations thereof are classed based on predetermined properties and an expression associated thereto (col. 4, lines 56-61); and
- selecting said predetermined key words from an input sentence and comparing with these expressions to obtain one or more sentences (inherent in col. 2, lines 46-47) or, alternatively, sentence classes that coincide or have a high degree of similarity as a result

of said comparison (col. 5, lines 19-21 and 31-35), in the latter case the class combinations are searched (col. 5, lines 43-49);

- said input sentence sometimes necessarily being converted into an expression comprising only key words or words equivalent thereto (*cf.* col 1, lines 23-24).

As per claims 14-15, Stentiford *et al.* teach:

- storing in a database bilingual sentences in original and target languages (Fig. 1, elements 1 and 2, with col. 2, lines 22-29);
- storing key words from said sentences (inherent in col. 2, lines 35-37);
- identifying predetermined combinations of key words as having a dependency relationship for forming expressions (col. 2, lines 35-42);
- inputting a sentence in the original language (Fig. 1, elements 3 or 5);
- extracting key words therefrom and forming trial combinations of key words and matching them with combinations having a dependency relationship (col. 2, lines 64-65);
- outputting a target language sentence having the highest number of matched trial combinations (col. 5, lines 43-49; Fig. 1, element 9, voice output in second language).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, because lines 4-7 thereof are translated from the Japanese in a very confusing and ambiguous way, making it hard to determine precisely what is and what is not being claimed therein.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Frederick Warwick Michael Stentiford *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,765,131, issued June 9, 1998), Yasuhara Asano *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,848,389, issued December 8, 1998), Hiyan Alshawhi *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,956,668, issued September 21, 1999), Kunihiro Seno *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,991,771 issued November 23, 1999), Jackson Chang *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,995,919, issued November 30, 1999), Tahako Hanada *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,026,407, issued February 15, 2000), Shogo Shibata *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,041,293, filed May 29, 1996), Andrew R. Golding (U.S. Patent 6,192,332, filed April 6, 1998), Alexander M. Franz *et al.* (U.S. Patents 6,266,642 and 6,356,865, both filed January 29, 1999), and Hiroshi Hayashi *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,321,188, filed October 16, 1995) teach translation of phrases from one language to another.

11. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

(non-fee Amendments should be directed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee)

or FAXed to:


(703) 872-9314 (please label *formal* communications
"OFFICIAL"; please label *informal* or draft communications,
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 2, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to the examiner, Talivaldis Ivars Smits, whose telephone number is (703) 306-3011. The examiner can normally be reached Mondays-Fridays from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold, can be reached on (703) 305-4379. The facsimile phone number for Technology Center 2600 is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 customer service, whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



TĀLIVALDIS IVARS ŠMITS
PRIMARY EXAMINER